

REMARKS

Introduction

Upon entry of the foregoing response, claims 1-5, 8-20 are pending in the application. Claims 6 and 7 were previously withdrawn from consideration. No claims have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 15-18 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,892,948 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter "Aoki"). Dependent claims 13, 14 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable to Aoki in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0114265 to Talbert (hereinafter "Talbert"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and submits that these claims are allowable over the cited references, for at least the following reasons.

Telephonic interviews were held with the Examiner on February 5th and 10th, 2009 where the previous arguments for allowance of these claims over the cited reference (Aoki) were reasserted, where these arguments were submitted in Applicant's prior Amendment dated September 11, 2008, and which Amendment is incorporated herein in its entirety. A copy of the Interview Summary dated February 18, 2009, which acknowledges those interviews, is submitted herewith.

Applicant hereby reasserts the arguments for allowance over Aoki previously made in Applicant's Amendment of September 11, 2008.

Regarding independent claims 1, 8 and 15, Applicant herein gives additional reasons for allowance of these claims over the cited reference. The Aoki reference describes use of a plurality of function boxes where each of the function boxes performs a selected operation on a data file, but the function boxes do not each have an associated "distinct visual display feature" that is associated with "each of different operations," as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits the same. All of the function boxes of Aoki have a same visual display feature, which is an "arrow head", and/or a "circle" which

merely indicates that an operation associated with a particular function box is executing. Each of the function boxes of Aoki, when executing an operation associated with a particular function box, has the same visual “arrowhead” and/or “operation executing” circle display.

Additionally, there clearly is no description in Aoki (which is admitted by the Examiner on page 4 of the Office Action) of “reselecting the file display for the single file to associate the selected second input with the single file,” as recited in the pending independent claims. In Aoki, a function box is selected to perform an operation on a data file, but the data file itself is not reselected in order to associate with the data file a second input (operation), as this feature is recited in the independent claims pending herein.

Furthermore, Aoki does not describe (as admitted on page 4 of the Office Action) “presenting a second distinct visual feature associated with the second operation in a second portion of the reselected file display of the single file such that the first distinct visual feature is also being presented,” as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. The data file display of Aoki is selected once and dragged into a function box for an operation to be performed on the data file, however, the data file display of Aoki is not the equivalent of a “file display” which has first and second distinct visual features presented where the first and second distinct visual features are associated, respectively, with first and second operations to be performed on a single file which is associated with a single file display. The data file displayed in Aoki does not present such a plurality of distinct visual features associated with operations to be performed on the data file.

Therefore, for at least all of the above reasons, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentably distinguishable over Aoki, and accordingly it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these independent claims be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 1, 8 and 15 is earnestly solicited.

Regarding dependent claims 2-5, 9-14 and 16-20, since these claims depend from independent claim 1, 8 or 15, these claims are allowable over Aoki for at least the same reasons given above in regard to independent claims 1, 8 and 15. Additionally, these claims are allowable over Talbert since Talbert does not overcome all the deficiencies of Aoki, as described above, nor was Talbert cited by the Examiner for that purpose.

Thus, for all of the above reasons, dependent claims 2-5, 9-14 and 16-20 are patentably

Serial No.: 10/759,932
Docket No.: AUS920030846US1
Reply to the Office Action of December 8, 2008

distinguishable over Aoki and Talbert, separately or in combination. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims 2-5, 9-14 and 16-20 be withdrawn, and allowance of claims 2-5, 9-14 and 16-20 is earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time, as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application, to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

DILLON & YUDELL, LLP

Dated: February 18, 2009
8911 N. Capital of Texas Hwy, Suite 2110
Austin, TX 78759
Telephone: (512) 343-6116

By: /Joseph W. King/
Joseph W. King
Registration No. 35, 768



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/759,932	01/16/2004	Vijaylaxmi Chakravarty	AUS920030846US1	8214
45502 7590 02/18/2009 DILLON & YUDELL LLP 8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY., SUITE 2110 AUSTIN, TX 78759			EXAMINER HEFFINGTON, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT 2179	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/18/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/759,932	CHAKRAVARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JOHN M. HEFFINGTON	2179	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JOHN M. HEFFINGTON. (3) _____.

(2) Joseph King 35,768. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5, 10 Feb 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,8 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Aoki et al. (US 5,892,948).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argues that selecting functions and then selecting a file icon to associate the selected functions with the file icon, adding a visual enhancement to the file icon representing each selected function, and then initiating the execution of the functions on the file reads over the cited prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Ba Huynh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179	
---	--